

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the October 8, 2004 Office Action and personal interview held on November 4, 2004. Applicant's undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the helpful and productive interview.

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is the sole independent claim.

As discussed during the interview, amendments have been made to the specification to overcome the objections to the specification and drawings. As also discussed, a new Figure 14 is added to the drawings. The remaining drawing sheets have been renumbered as appropriate to indicate that there are now 9 total sheets. Each drawing sheet submitted herewith has also been designated as a "Replacement Sheet." A brief description of new Figure 14 has been added to page 14 of Applicant's specification. A detailed description of the new Figure has been added to page 28.

Amended claim 1 distinguishes over the prior art by, *inter alia*, reciting first and second hinged components extending substantially over the length of at least one portion of the sash frame and being hingedly attached to respective glazing pane mounting surfaces and/or the inner facing frame surface. The first and second hinged components are adapted to be pivoted towards the first and second glazing pane mounting surfaces, respectively.

The Frank reference cited by the Examiner (US 4,407,105) does not have hinged components "hingedly attached" to at least one of a glazing pane mounting surface or an inner facing frame surface. Frank merely describes a vapor seal 17 with edges 20 and 21 that deform

when U-legs 11 of a spacer 13 are inserted into grooves 19. Vapor seal 17 is a flexible sheet that readily bends at its edges when pressure is applied by the legs 11.

Moreover, edges 20, 21 of the vapor seal are not hingedly attached to a frame. The flexible vapor seal sheet is merely laid over the frame prior to insertion of the spacer 13 into the grooves 19. And, neither the sheet 17 nor its edges 20, 21 function as glazing beads as set forth in Applicant's claims 2, 3, 5 and 6. A glazing bead is understood in the art to be an aesthetic component that hides the edges of the glazing pane and its sealant from view. The sheet 17 disclosed by Frank cannot serve this function, as the edges 20, 21 of the sheet do not extend above the glass-holding grooves 2 into which the glass panes are inserted.

With respect to Applicant's claim 8, the first and second hinged components serve a different purpose; i.e., to hold at least one of a glazing pane, an insulated glass unit, a window screen or an energy panel to the window sash. As pointed out during the interview, the edges 20, 21 of flexible sheet 17 of the Frank reference would be too flimsy to serve this purpose. Thus, Frank does not disclose or suggest hinged components of any type, let alone such components that function as glazing beads (Applicant's claims 2, 3, 5 and 6) or that hold an element to the window sash (Applicant's claim 8).

Accordingly, Applicants' independent claim 1, and each of claims 2-9 dependent thereon, are clearly patentable over the cited reference. Further remarks regarding the asserted relationship between Applicant's claims and the prior art are not deemed necessary, in view of the foregoing discussion. Applicant's silence as to any of the Examiner's comments is not indicative of an acquiescence to the stated grounds of rejection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the present application, allow each of the pending claims, and to pass this application on to an early issue. If there are any remaining matters that need to be addressed in order to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Barry R. Lipsitz
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 28,637
755 Main Street
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 459-0200

Attorney Docket No. IND-114.1
November 12, 2004